Title II Project Application COOS BAY DISTRICT Resource Advisory Committee

l. Project Number	(Assigned by federal	unit):
-------------------	----------------------	--------

2. Project Name: Wood Creek Culvert Replacement	3. County: Coos			
4. Project Sponsor: Coquille Watershed Association	5. Date: 2/18/02			
6. Sponsor=s Phone Number: (541) 396-2229				
7. Sponsors E-mail: jennifer.hampel@verizon.net				

8. Project Location (attach project area map)					
a. 4th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known): North Fork Coquille River					
b. 5 th Field Watershed Name and HUC #(if known):					
c. Legal Location:	Township 28S	Range <u>12</u>	2W	Section(s) 15	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
	Township	Range Sec	ction(s)	
d. BLM District			e. B	LM Resource Area	
f. National Forest			g. F	orest Service District	
h State / Private / (Other lands invo	olved?	ו ח	No	

9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

Improve access to approximately one (1) mile of good spawning and rearing habitat for salmonids and other fish species.

10. Project Description: (Provide concise description of project and attach map.)

This project would replace the existing 80 foot long, 4' 8" diameter pipe with an open bottom arch structure. BLM engineers could complete the design work through an MOU with the Coquille Watershed Association. The streams drains about 1600 acres and has approximately one mile of stream under 3% gradient. The culvert is a fish passage barrier due to being undersized and both the inlet and outlet are blocked.

Title II Project Application COOS BAY DISTRICT Resource Advisory Committee

11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands? Ves □No If yes, then describe

The Coquille Watershed Association has completed two culvert replacements upstream, in cooperation with Port Blakely Tree Farms. Port Blakely also completed several miles of road improvements to the upper watershed as well as planting the riparian are with mixed conifers. The CWA is also working with the upstream dairy farm to replace a small culvert and complete riparian improvements.

12. How does proposed project meet purposes	of the Logiclation? [See 2027bV1]
□Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [See	c. 2(b)]
XImplements stewardship objectives that enhance fore □Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)] XRestores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]	est ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
13. Project Type (check one) [Sec. 203(b)(1)]	
XRoad Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	□Trail Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
□Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	\Box Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]

□Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify): [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
□Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]
□Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]

□Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)] □Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

★Fish Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)] □Control of Noxious Weeds [Sec. 2(b)(2)(F)]

□Reestablish Native Species [Sec. 2(b)(2)(G)] □Other Project Type (specify) [Sec. 2(b)(2)]:

14. Measure of Project Accomplishments/Expected Outcomes [Sec. 203(b)(5)]

a. Total Acres:1600 b. Total Miles: 1

c. No. Structures: 1 d. Est. People Reached

(for environmental education projects):

e. No. Laborer Days: 14

f. Other (specify):

15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date: [Sec. 203(b)(2)]

Project could begin July 1, 2002 and be complete by September 15, 2002. This project should not take more than 2 weeks to complete, though.

16. Target Species Benefited: (if applicable)

Coho salmon, and Chinook Salmon as well as non-salmonid species and other aquatic organisms will benefit from the replacement of this culvert.

Title II Project Application COOS BAY DISTRICT Resource Advisory Committee

17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

This project would be a "Wyden Amendment" project that has been reviewed and endorsed by BLM, Coquille Watershed Association (Projects Committee), Coos County Highway Department, ODFW, and the TAG.

18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities. This project would benefit a federally listed species (coho salmon), as well as improver overall watershed health.

19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

The North Fork Coquille River has been designated as a core area for salmonid restoration. Furtermore, this project will benefit a federally listed species.

20. Status of Project Planning a. NEPA Complete: **X**Yes \square No If no, give est. date of completion: c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: □Yes *****No d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete: *No □Yes e. Survey & Manage Complete: \Box Yes $\square No$ XNot Applicable f. DSL/ODFW* Permits for In-stream Work Obtained: □Not Applicable □Yes **X**No g. DSL/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained: □Yes **X**No □Not Applicable h. SHPO* Concurrence Received: \square No XNot Applicable □Yes i. Project Design(s) Completed: □Yes XNo * DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer 21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment **X**Contract □Federal Workforce XCounty Workforce □Volunteers □Other (specify): 22. Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? [Sec. 204(e)(3)] □Yes **X**No

Title II Project Application COOS BAY DISTRICT Resource Advisory Committee

23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

a. Total County Title II Funds Requested:\$80,000.00

b. Is this a multi-year funding request? □Yes XNo If yes, then display by fiscal year

c. FY02 Request: f. FY05 Request: d. FY03 Request: g. FY06 Request:

e. FY04 Request:

Table 1. Project Cost Analysis

Item	Column A Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column B Requested County Title II Contribution [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column C Other Contributions [Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Column D Total Available Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys		\$2,000.00	\$500.00	\$2,500.00
25. NEPA & Sec. 7 ESA Consultation26. Permit Acquisition			\$500.00	\$500.00
27. Project Design & Engineering			\$15,000.00	\$15,000.0
28. Contract Preparation			\$500.00.	\$500.00
29. Contract Administration				
30. Contract Cost		\$50,000.00		\$50,000.0
31. Workforce Cost				
32. Materials & Supplies		\$25,000.00		\$25,000.0
33. Monitoring			\$1,500.00	\$1,500.00
34. Other				
35. Project Sub-Total				
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead)		\$3,000.00		\$3,000.00
(per year for multi-year projects)				
37. Total Cost Estimate		\$80,000.00	\$18,000.00	\$98,000.0

38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding for Project Identified Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

Title II Project Application COOS BAY DISTRICT Resource Advisory Committee

39.	Monitoring	Plan	[Sec	2030	h)(6)	1
-	11101111011116	1 1411	DUC.	200	v_{Λ}	\mathbf{v}_{i}	- 1

a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

The Coquille Watershed Association will conduct all pre and post project monitoring for this project. Monitoring will include spawning surveys as well as juvenile counts.

b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

N/A

c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from federal lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

N/A

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, item 33)

Amount: \$1,500.00

Title II Project Application COOS BAY DISTRICT Resource Advisory Committee

County Commissioner Concurrence

(Majority Required per charter)

A majority of the county commissioners of	District Advisory Council and agree with the
Attested by Commissioner	 Date
Comments/Rational:	